

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please substitute the attached drawings, 1 page, Fig. 4, for the drawing presently on file. In Fig. 4, the reference numeral for the box at the bottom left is changed from "3" to --6--.

Attachment: The replacement sheet for Fig. 4 is at the back of this paper.

REMARKS

In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

The specification is amended to correct a typographical error. No new matter is added.

A replacement sheet of Fig. 4 is submitted herewith.

Claims 1-33 are in the application.

All claims are amended to conform to United States' practice, for example, by removing parenthetical references. Claims 1, 3, and 22 are amended to correct grammatical errors. No new matter is added.

I. Claim Rejection - 35 USC §102

The rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 14-17, 22, and 33 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Chang et al., (US 6,313,790) is traversed.

Applicants disclose the structure of three fixed bases where at least one fixed base has a transmitter, a receiver and a clock. When more than one base has a clock, the clocks are synchronized with each other. The transmitter emits pulses in a determined frequency, at a predetermined reference instant and containing information of the instant of emission. Each pulse from each fixed base is transmitted to all the fixed bases through a communication device located in the space platform.

Applicants recite, in claim 1, the structure of:

A geographic and space positioning system ... [of] ...a first, a second, and a third base ... which are fixed ... and each having a previously known location;

a control unit which is operatively connected to both the transmitter and the receiver, in order to calculate, for each pulse emission instant, the lateral edges of a tetrahedron, whose vertices are defined by the three fixed bases and by the space platform, based upon the determination of the propagation time of each pulse, in said trajectory, between the space platform and each fixed base in order to allow determining a respective extension of the trajectory of the space platform...

{W:\06290\0204213-us0\01499785.DOC 130}

Clearly, Applicants disclose a device which operates differently than the device of Chang with structure which is positively recited in claim 1 which is not disclosed or suggested by Chang. Therefore, it is understood that claim 1 avoids Chang and is in condition for allowance. Claims 3-6, 14-17 depend from claim 1 and, therefore, are also in condition for allowance. For the reasons noted above, claim 22 and claim 33 which depends from claim 22 recite limiting features which avoid the Cheng reference.

The rejection of claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-8, 14-18, 21-23, 28, and 30-31 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Knight et al., (US 5,570,096) is traversed.

{W:\06290\0204213-us0\01499785.DOC 11/21/2001 10:01:00 AM}

The solutions by Knight and Chang are addressed to satellite position determination, using the principle of range measurement combined to range rate determination, the latter usually inferred from the carrier Doppler frequency drift. This is clarified in the respective texts of the two patents. In Knight and Chang, for determining the position and speed of the satellite, it is necessary to know the position variation and the time variation, which is obtained with the Doppler effect. The use of this principle is known since the very beginning of space exploration. The final satellite position determination requires a certain time interval to define the Doppler shifts association to the different range measurements - which cannot be obtained with a single measurement, at a given instant. The differences presented by Knight and Chang refer to the number of ground bases, their physical arrangements and differences in the processes of range and combined range rate measurements.

{W:\06290\0204213-us0\01499785.DOC [REDACTED]}

Clearly, for the reasons noted above, claim 1 avoids the Knight reference and is in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 4-5, 7-8, 14-18, and 21 depend from claim 1 and are also considered to be in condition for allowance. For the reasons noted above, claim 22 recites limiting features similar to those of claim 1 which avoid the Knight reference. Claims 23, 28, and 30-31 depend from claim 22 and, therefore, are also in condition for allowance.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

The allowance of claims 9-13, 19-20, 24-27 and 32 if amended to overcome the rejections under 35 USC § 112 as set forth in the Office Action, and if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims is noted with appreciation.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below if the Examiner believes any issue can be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment. In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: May 27, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Louis J. DelJuidice

Registration No.: 47,522

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 770

Church Street Station

New York, New York 10008-0770

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant